

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-16, and 18-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 13, and 16 are independent. Claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 13, 16, and 19 are amended. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in view of the following remarks.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representatives by Examiner Tan at the interview held on August 5, 2008, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

In section 3 on pages 2-9, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-6, 8-16 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by "Managing Your Network with HP OpenView Network Node Manager" (hereinafter "HP"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites "bundling connections between said network device and groups of network devices into a plurality of outside links wherein said map corresponds to said area of interest and each outside link represents a group of network device outside said map" (emphasis added). Claims 6, 13, and 16 contain similar recitations. The subject matter finds support in, for example, paragraphs [0022]-[0026] of the published version of the specification.

The recited subject matter provides network operators with a simple way of selecting an area of interest in a network to view while bundling, into a multiple link connector icon, all links

connecting network devices in the area of interest with devices outside the area of interest. This provides a significant advantage, as the operator is able to select an area of interest, while simultaneously viewing all links to network devices outside of the area of interest without cluttering the map. Furthermore, the operator is able to view the relationship between the area of interest and the entire network in a single map.

These advantages are achieved by giving the operator the ability to select an area of interest to view on the network. All links outside the area of interest are bundled into several groups of "outside links." Outside links are further bundled into a multiple link connectors represented by a multiple link connector icon. The area of interest is shown on a map consisting of network objects in the area of interest and multiple link connectors representing connections to all objects outside the area of interest.

Applicant respectfully submits that HP fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the above-quoted and explained subject matter. The system of HP allows a user to view submaps organized in a hierarchical fashion, each submap representing a particular view of the network environment. For example, as explained on p. 202 of HP, a user is able to navigate through the submap by double-clicking on explodable symbols, thereby displaying a more detailed view of that submap. *See page 202, Paragraph 3-5*. For example, a submap representing an entire organization may contain symbols representing the perspective of particular locations, which in turn contains specific departments. *See id.*

Thus, HP does not bundle links outside the area of interest in several groups of outside links and further bundle the groups into a single icon. Instead, the system of HP represents a

system in a hierarchical fashion. Each submap contains symbols representing elements within the area of interest. Clicking on an explodable symbol opens a submap that displays a more detailed view of the area of interest, but does not show elements outside the area of interest.

Accordingly, HP fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "bundling connections between said network device and groups of network devices into a plurality of outside links wherein said map corresponds to said area of interest and each outside link represents a group of network device outside said map." as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 6, 13, and 16.

Claims 3-5 are allowable based at least on their dependencies from claim 1. Claims 8-12 are allowable based at least on their dependencies from claim 6. Claims 14 and 15 are allowable based at least on their dependencies from claim 13. Claims 18-20 are allowable based at least on their dependencies from claim 16.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 8-16 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over HP be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

While we believe that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Application No: 10/825,172
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3130

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.



Terry W. Kramer
Registration No.: 41,541

Date: August 28, 2008

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-519-9801
Fax: 703-519-9802